

Appl. No. 10/629,086
Amdt. dated Jan. 31, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 2, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 7. This sheet, which includes Fig. 7, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 7. In Fig. 7, the element labeled 222 including elements 211a, 211b, 211c, and 211d has been changed to element 211.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Appl. No. 10/629,086
Amdt. dated Jan. 31, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 2, 2004

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated November 2, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended, and new claims 29 and 30 have been added, leaving claims 1-30 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. The Examiner's indication that claims 4-7, 11, 18-21 and 23-25 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors, and the amendment is fully supported by the disclosure. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Drawings

The drawings have been amended to correct a typographical error. On Fig. 7, the element 222 that included elements 211a, 211b, 211c, and 211d has been corrected to have the reference numeral 211. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 12-14

Claims 1-3 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yajima et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0041268 (hereinafter "Yajima").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is submitted that Yajima fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

Yajima merely discloses a shielding member 51 made of a transparent conductive sheet or metal mesh (see paragraph [0180]) with no mention of a specific structure for the shielding member including shielding lines. In contrast, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines. Since, Yajima fails to disclose a specific structure of the electromagnetic-wave shielding member that includes

Appl. No. 10/629,086
Amdt. dated Jan. 31, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 2, 2004

“shielding lines”, Yajima fails to teach the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Yajima. Claims 2, 3, and 12-14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claims 2, 3, and 12-14 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

Claims 15-17, 26 and 27

Claims 15-17, 26 and 27 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yajima.

Applicants have amended claim 15 to recite, *inter alia*, the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines. As stated above regarding claim 1, there is no disclosure in Yajima of the specific structure of the electromagnetic-wave shielding member that includes shielding lines. Thus, Yajima fails to teach the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines, as recited in amended claim 15.

Accordingly, claim 15 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Yajima. Claims 16, 17, 26 and 27 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 15, thus include all the limitations of claim 15. Thus, claims 16, 17, 26 and 27 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 15, which is believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 1-3, 12-17, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed.

Appl. No. 10/629,086
Amdt. dated Jan. 31, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 2, 2004

Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). See MPEP 2143.

Claims 8 and 9

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima in view of Takahashi et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0074655 (hereinafter "Takahashi").

As mentioned above, Yajima fails to teach the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines as recited in claim 1. Takahashi is directed to an LCD module with a transparent organic protecting film disposed on an electromagnetic wave shielding unit 6 in paragraphs [0094] and [0097]. While the electromagnetic wave shielding unit 6 of Takahashi may correspond to the electromagnetic-wave shielding member of the claimed invention, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Takahashi of an electromagnetic-wave shielding member including "shielding lines". Thus the cited references do not render claim 1 obvious. Claims 8 and 9 depend indirectly from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of claim 1. The dependent claims 8 and 9 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for the independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections of claims 8 and 9.

Claims 10, 22 and 28

Claims 10, 22 and 28 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima.

As mentioned above, Yajima fails to teach the electromagnetic-wave shielding member including shielding lines as recited in both claim 1 and claim 15. Claim 10 depends indirectly from claim 1, thus includes all the limitations of claim 1. Claims 22 and 28 depend indirectly from claim 15, thus include all the limitations of claim 15. The dependent claims 10, 22 and 28 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above for the independent claims 1 and 15.

Thus, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 10, 22 and 28

Appl. No. 10/629,086
Amdt. dated Jan. 31, 2005
Reply to Office action of Nov. 2, 2004

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 29 and 30 to more particularly define aspects of the present invention. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: _____


Chad L. Thorson
Reg. No. 55,675
Confirmation No. 5970
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 31, 2005